

jobs and it gives us our energy independence.

The President has said we have 2 percent of the world's oil, but we utilize 25 percent of the world's oil with our vehicles. Now I agree, we use 25 percent; we've got a lot of cars on the roads, we have a lot of goods movement, but 2 percent? The number is flawed again. As we went through the Natural Resources Committee, we have over 65 percent of the world's natural resources between natural gas, oil, and oil shale, we just have to be willing to go get it. So rather than going to Brazil, rather than going to the Middle East and putting our troops at risk, we ought to be self-sufficient and utilize our own natural resources and put Americans back to work in the process.

Now in my district, we've got natural resource issues as well. We've seen timber issues across the Nation. In Arizona, we've seen catastrophic disasters with national forests. In my district we've got national or natural forests as well. These national forests we've got to manage better. We've got to be able to take the fuel off of the forest floor. We've got to be able to harvest some of the timber. We'll never catch up at this point because our timber harvesting plants are so far behind. But nevertheless, we've got to put Americans back to work, we've got to put Californians back to work dealing with our timber industry.

And in the Central Valley, where we have the largest abundance of ag production, all of the fresh fruits, the nuts, packaged salads, we have so many different things that California produces and yet we see some of the highest unemployment in the Nation. As our national unemployment continues to escalate, we're at 9.1 percent now, we're double that in the Central Valley, and it's a direct correlation to the water. One of our natural resources, when you shut off the water to the valley and only give it 10 percent of the contracted allocation, you have 36 percent unemployment. And in some cities it's even higher. When you go to the food lines and you see Americans—44 percent unemployment in some cities—it seems un-American to not utilize our natural resources.

So we have the ability in this great Nation. We have the bills that we're passing off of this floor. What we need to do is have the will to move them through both Houses and encourage the President to have American jobs—not Republican jobs, these aren't Republican jobs, not Democratic jobs, but American jobs; putting people back to work; avoiding the natural disasters that happen with forest fires and the natural disasters we have with flooding when we don't manage our water; creating clean energy in the process. But the most important issue, when you've got 9.1 percent unemployment and escalating across the Nation, when you've got double that in the Central Valley and continuing to escalate but you have the natural resources and the

ability to solve your own problems but ignore the fact and don't do so, we have an American problem with jobs.

As Republicans, we are willing to fix that problem. We will continue to pass these natural resources bills, but at some point we would ask our friends across the aisle to work with us. We will not solve California's energy problems or the Nation's job issue without addressing our natural resources.

REPUBLICAN AGENDA LACKS COMMON SENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman who preceded me in the well talked about unemployment and creating jobs. I may not have agreed with his particular nostrums, but at least that's one Republican who's talking about creating jobs.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority, in the last 6 months of leadership in the House, has brought forward no bills to put Americans back to work except they say do more of the same. What? Yes, more of the same.

The last decade, George Bush dramatically cut taxes—twice—decreased regulations under the theory that that would create jobs. Unfortunately, the facts are in. We had the worst job creation post World War II in the last decade under George Bush and doubled the deficit and debt while doing it. It didn't create jobs. Trickle down economics doesn't work. It didn't work in the Reagan era. It didn't work then. Compare that to the Clinton era. We raised taxes, yes, particularly on rich people and big corporations. We actually balanced the budget, we paid down debt, we had 3.8 percent unemployment, and real incomes went up for the middle class. I'd love to go back to those "bad old days," but no, it's the Bush policies that will work, we've just got to do more of them. Reduce spending even more.

Government can't do anything to create jobs, they say. Well, what about investing in the Nation's infrastructure? Who built the national highway system? Who built the bridges? Who built the transit systems in this country? Who helped build the rail systems? Who has maintained our ports and waterways? The Federal Government—sometimes in partnership with States or local government or the private sector. But those investments pay off.

And what do the Republicans want to do? In the face of 150,000 bridges on the national highway system that are about to—or in the not-too-distant future—have the same fate as the bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota that is collapsed, they need either total replacement or repair 150,000 bridges; 40 percent of the pavement on the national highway system; \$60 billion backlog on our transit systems.

They want to cut Federal investment in transit. And they say if we give that

money to rich people and to the corporations—who are sitting on \$2 trillion worth of cash—they'll take care of the problem. Oh, really? What are you going to do, toll 150,000 bridges across the country in order to induce the private sector to come in and rebuild them? Are you going to toll the existing interstate in order to bring it up to a decent system of good repair?

And transit systems, they all lose money. Now some on the Republican side say, well, we should just do away with transit systems, we don't need those things. Come on, let's have a little bit of common sense here. You want to talk about saving fuel? Invest in transit. You want to talk about creating jobs? Invest in infrastructure. We have the strongest Buy American requirements in transportation and infrastructure as any program of the Federal Government. We create more jobs per billion dollars than anything else. Way more than the Defense Department—where they want to shower all their funds—can be created in transportation. You can put Americans to work; not only construction workers who have horrible unemployment, not only steel workers for the bridges, not only people who maintain these systems, but engineers, software engineers, people who make tires, people who make rail cars, people who make streetcars.

□ 1100

We are making street cars in America for the first time in 70 years in Oregon due to one of those horrible earmarks they want to ban. We were buying them overseas. Now we are making them in America. Is that bad? They seem to think it is, and they want to decrease investment in these sorts of things that are proven job generators.

Now, I have to give the Obama administration a big fat D-minus on this same issue. The so-called stimulus, which they rightly criticize, which I voted against, \$800 million, 40 percent of it was Bush tax cuts, which didn't work for Bush and didn't work for Obama. Now all the Obama administration is talking about is more tax cuts. Extending the payroll tax holiday on Social Security, that will put America back to work.

Give me a break. These things haven't worked. We need real investment. If you borrow money to build a bridge that lasts 100 years, at least you can look your kids and grandkids straight in the eye when they say, what did you do with all that money, because I am still paying the bills 30 years from now. And you can say, we built that bridge you drove over to go to work. We rebuilt that transit system that you took to work today. We made America more competitive in the international economy with those investments.

You have got to start distinguishing between investments and wasteful spending. If you want to talk about cut-and-spend, then let's talk about it.

Subsidies to people to not grow things, \$5 billion a year; another \$15 billion a year in agriculture subsidies to grow surplus crops? Don't want to touch that one. Tax loopholes, giveaways to the oil companies, let's cut that. No, we can't cut the tax subsidies to the oil companies.

You know, common guys, let's get real here. Let's invest in America, in the American people, and put people back to work. We need a real program, and you people have offered us nothing.

DEMOCRATS HAVE WRITTEN THE WRONG PRESCRIPTION FOR MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today not just as a Congressman, but as a physician with nearly 30 years of experience treating and interacting with patients. Wearing both of these hats has allowed me to understand our health care system at each end of the spectrum, and it allows me to say with absolute certitude that the Democrats and President Obama have written the wrong prescription for Medicare. With 47 million Americans relying on our Medicare system and millions more to enter soon, it is absolutely irresponsible not to inform the public accurately of the facts about its current path if left unchanged.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, when the President's health care bill was signed into law, it ended Medicare as we know it. According to the nonpartisan Medicare Actuary, Medicare will run out of money in 2024. That is what, 13 years from now. The Congressional Budget Office says it will be as soon as 2020, 9 years from now.

House Republicans have chosen to face the facts and responsibly proposed a comprehensive plan for Medicare. The Republican budget saves Medicare by maintaining benefits as they are for those 55 years and older, while also strengthening it by bringing true choice and competition to maintain and save Medicare for our children and for our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' plan for Medicare reform is included in the 2,400 pages of, you guessed it, ObamaCare, which is bad for American seniors and bad for the country. Their plan empowers a panel of unelected bureaucrats to ration senior health care. This panel will focus its cuts on the chronically ill and the disabled, these Medicare recipients who need care the most because they use the most health care services.

Health care rationing has never, Mr. Speaker, has never been the American way, but it certainly appears to be the Democrats' way. As a doctor, I know that the last thing patients need are bureaucrats who are unanswerable to the public, indeed, even to the Congress, making health choices for them.

The Democrats' plan also allows for a \$500 billion raid on Medicare to fund

programs in ObamaCare, a fact that they have conveniently ignored while they are consistently criticizing Republicans for so-called "cutting" care. The plan put forth by President Obama and the Democrats is a plan that cuts Medicare for seniors today, and it leaves Medicare bankrupt for our future generations, our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, my diagnosis is that American seniors should be worried only if we sit back and do nothing about Medicare or accept the Democrats' plan to gut it from sick and disabled seniors. We cannot allow it to continue on its current path to insolvency, as the Democrats and President Obama would have it. We need to support Medicare reform now so that we will have Medicare tomorrow, and that includes eliminating this rationing board as soon as possible.

OPPOSE THE SECURE COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. I rise today in strong opposition to the Secure Communities program. I am for the stated goals of the Secured Communities program. Anyone who is undocumented in this country and who has been convicted of a serious violent offense should be removed from this country, period. But I can't support the program because of the significant evidence that Secure Communities is failing to achieve its goal.

When you look at the numbers, nearly half of the undocumented individuals from my home county of Los Angeles who have been taken into custody through this program have not committed or been convicted of a serious violent offense, and that is a problem.

Take the story of Isaura Garcia, a 20-year-old who suffered three turbulent years of abuse and beatings at the hands of her boyfriend. In February, she finally found the courage to call 911 for help. Earlier that day, her boyfriend, Ricardo, had thrown Isaura and their 1-year-old daughter out of their apartment. When she came back to the house to get her things, Ricardo showed up and it began again. He started throwing things at her, and when she tried to protect herself and her child she accidentally scratched his neck.

After the 911 call, the police showed up and put her boyfriend in cuffs, but after they saw the scratches, they took them off of him and put them on Isaura. Shocked at what was happening, she fainted. At the hospital, doctors found bruises covering her body from the weeks and years of abuse. Despite being identified by a doctor as a victim of domestic violence, she had been arrested as the abuser.

After the arrest, Isaura landed in the L.A. County jail, which was participating in the Secure Communities pro-

gram. Because of this program, she was fingerprinted and found to be here in an undocumented way. It was too late. Before she knew it, she was sent to an immigration detention center in Santa Ana.

It is stories like Isaura's that are causing the DHS inspector general to investigate the Secure Communities program. Washington State, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D.C., refused to join Secure Communities. New York, Illinois, and Massachusetts are suspending their participation in this program, and California is discussing this as well.

But that is only a first step. The concerns about Secure Communities must be properly and permanently addressed. This is first and foremost about public safety. The people on the front lines of this program, our police officers, have expressed serious concerns about its implementation. LAPD Chief Beck has noted that the program is causing a breach of trust between the LAPD and our immigrant communities, hindering our officers' duties to protect and serve all of our residents. And the numerous reports of domestic violence victims being detained through this program are simply unacceptable. If a program is causing a victim of violence to fear reaching out for help, then that program is causing more harm than good.

Secure Communities has undermined our police departments' mission of protecting the public, it has weakened protections against racial profiling, and it will have a chilling effect on immigrants' willingness to report crimes or provide useful information to the police.

We must take a long, hard look at the negative effects of Secure Communities. We must allow States to opt out of the program. We must protect the safety and welfare of all our residents and truly ensure that we will have safer, more secure communities.

□ 1110

SAVING MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, Bloomberg News released an analysis, district by district around America, of the highest concentration of 45- to 54-year-olds. The reason they did this analysis was to see and focus on where the impact of the Republican Medicare plan would land the hardest. In the top 10 districts which they identified, the headline of this article, which obviously is Bloomberg News, a nonpartisan news service, was: Medicare Cuts Would Hit Republican Lawmakers. Nine out of the top 10 districts in America with that highest 45 to 54 concentration are Republican districts. The 10th is the Second Congressional District, which I